

Washington's Scenic and Recreational Highways Plan

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments on Background Paper #1

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Comment [V1] According to RCW 47.06.050, a Scenic and Recreational Highways Plan is not "required" as an element to the Multi-Modal Plan. This needs to be corrected as it is misleading.</p>	<p>RCW 47.06.050 states, "The state-owned facilities component of the statewide multimodal transportation plan shall consist of.... (d) A scenic and recreational highways element, which shall identify and recommend designation of scenic and recreational highways, provide for enhanced access to scenic, recreational, and cultural resources associated with designated routes, and recommend a variety of management strategies to protect, preserve, and enhance these resources. The department, affected counties, cities, and towns, regional transportation planning organizations, and other state or federal agencies shall jointly develop this element"</p>
<p>Comment [V3] RCW 47.39 does not define or state the term Scenic Byways and Recreational Highways as interchangeable; it does distinguish roadways, such as – Scenic Byways and All-American Roadways – and it does identify each as part of the scenic and recreational highway system.</p>	<p>The terms Scenic Byway; National Scenic Byway; and All American Road are not defined in state law in terms of there specific highway sections. The term Scenic and Recreational Highway is defined and segments of state highway are listed in the law. Interim federal guidance for the National Scenic Byway Grant Program discusses the term "Scenic Byway".</p>
<p>Comment [V4] Is this provided to support the idea that the Scenic and Recreational Highway and Scenic Byways are interchangeable? If so, RCW 47.42.025 seems to contradict this as it excludes sections of the Scenic and Recreational Highway System from the Scenic System.</p>	<p>Scenic and Recreational Highways are part of the Scenic System with few exceptions (as listed in the law). There are less than 30 miles (less than 1%) of the Scenic System that are not defined as Scenic and Recreational Highways. It is not clear what the concern is.</p>
<p>Comment [S6] To be clear, this report should also refer ONLY to scenic and recreational highways and ONLY Scenic Byways, where applicable. Scenic Byways have different requirements and intrinsic qualities. These tow terms must be made excruciatingly clear throughout the plan.</p> <p>Can WSDOT please post the latest map on the list-serve as well as on the scenic byway discussion area? (when we met with Paula we received a copy of the map.) Also, for historic progress, can you create a timeline with maps showing how these have changed since the Scenic Byways Program was conceived?</p>	<p>Scenic and Recreational Highways are defined in state law (RCW 47.39). With few exception, a state highway is identified as a Scenic and Recreational Highway in order to be eligible to apply for National Scenic Byway grant funding. Historically, the term Scenic Byways has been used to refer to routes designated for marketing purposes. WSDOT has distinguished between the two in the map available on the website: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/C47B4957-A37A-4898-8513-35F9981A9C52/0/ScenicByways_Compare_v2.pdf</p> <p>The map was posted on the website in mid-July. Historic maps are available.</p>

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Comment [S7] How many miles make up scenic byways as of 2009? What is the percentage of byway compared to the highways in Washington? What is the percentage of Scenic and Recreational Highways compared to highways in Washington?</p>	<p>There are 4,006 miles of Scenic and Recreational Highways listed in state law (RCW 47.39). There are 2737 miles of marketing routes identified on the map made in 2006. State law gives the authority to identify routes for mapping and marketing purposes, but not outside the sections of state highway defined as scenic and recreational highways. Some of the 2737 miles of marketing routes appear to be outside the scenic and recreational highways.</p>
<p>Comment [V8] Is the state highway system the same as the Scenic System – as described in the paragraph above? If not, it would be valuable to know what this system is and how much of the Scenic System makes up the State Highway System.</p>	<p>State Highways are defined in state law and together make up the State Highway System. As stated in Background Paper #1 there are approximately 7,000 miles of state highways in Washington. There are 4,006 miles of Scenic and Recreational Highways that with few exception make up the Scenic System. An additional 30 miles of the Scenic System that are not identified as Scenic and Recreational Highways. More than half of the state highways in Washington are identified as Scenic and Recreational Highways.</p>
<p>Comment [S9] This is confusing: a state scenic byway is not necessarily a national scenic byway; state scenic byways are also eligible for FHWA's funding. Is this required by state law? Interim guidelines do not require legislative action.</p>	<p>This is un-necessarily confusing. That is why WSDOT is using terminology per the state law (47.39) which recognizes Scenic and Recreational Highways. State law does not define the term "state scenic byway". We will revise the sentence to read, "It is the intent of federal legislation that a segment of state highway is recognized in state law in order to become eligible to apply for National Scenic Byway grant funding."</p>
<p>Comment [V11] This question should not be asked in connection to Scenic Byways as it is not consistent with the federal guidelines that created the Scenic Byway program, including: The FOCUS – Scenic Byway Managers/Communities along a scenic byway create a corridor management plan (CMP) to establish a FOCUS which addresses local needs as well as user services. WSDOT cannot possibly identify a single FOCUS that represents all Scenic Byway communities, nor is it WSDOT's Role to do this.</p>	<p>The purpose of the plan is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance to WSDOT programs • Inform other planning efforts such as the Washington Transportation Plan • Provide heightened awareness of the value of the state scenic system • Fulfill the need to include a Scenic and Recreational component to the Multi-Modal Transportation Plan as required by state law (RCW 47.06). <p>This Plan will establish programmatic objectives and performance measures consistent with the State's transportation policy goals (RCW 47.04.280) and will be updated every two years.</p>

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Comment [V12] WSDOT is responsible for “providing technical assistance and guidance” for this program to byway managers who lead project planning and development, etc.</p>	<p>We believe this comment is referring to WSDOT’s role in administering the National Scenic Byways Grant Program. WSDOT also has a role in managing the Scenic and Recreational Highways outlined in state law (primarily RCW 47.39 and 47.42).</p>
<p>Comment [V13] There are six intrinsic qualities in order to qualify as a Scenic Byway. Is this cited in this background paper?</p>	<p>No. The Scenic and Recreational Highways Plan is focused on meeting the intent of state law rather than discussing or describing the eligibility requirements for the National Scenic Byways Grant Program.</p>
<p>Comment [S15] Reference is made to scenic and recreational highways, which can include scenic byways, but does not specifically mention scenic byways. Cannot find the “Statewide Multi-Modal Transportation Plan” on-line to refer to.</p>	<p>The terms Scenic Byway; National Scenic Byway; and All American Road are not defined in state law in terms of there specific highway sections. The term Scenic and Recreational Highway is defined and segments of state highway are listed in the law. Interim federal guidance for the National Scenic Byway Grant Program discusses the term “Scenic Byway”.</p> <p>The Statewide Multi-Modal Transportation Plan is available on WSDOT’s website at: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/planning/wtp It is being updated by Washington State Transportation Commission now.</p>
<p>Comment [V16] ...DOT is not required to create a Scenic and Recreational Highways Plan as part of the Multi-Modal Transportation Plan, as stated in the background paper. Bullet point 1 is addressing Scenic and Recreational Highways and Bullet point 2 is addressing just Scenic Byways. Is 1 asking to develop designation guidelines for Scenic Byways or Recreational Highways? If so, Washington State has operated a Scenic Byways Program for over 20 years and has been participating in the federal (grant) program since the early 90s. What guidelines we used for designation? Additionally, the federal program provides guidelines for Scenic Byway designation which WSDOT should adopt if not using already. Bullet point 3 addresses strategies for protecting, preserving, etc. each Scenic Byways CMP includes a strategy for maintaining and enhancing the byway’s qualities – as described in FHWA guidelines.</p>	<p>WSDOT refers to all elements of the Statewide Multi-Modal Plan as individual plans for example: Aviation Plan, Freight Mobility Plan, Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, Highway System Plan. Not sure what the concern is with this practice.</p> <p>The requirements of the state law are re-stated here in Background Paper #1 (RCW 47.06.050).</p>

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Comment [V17] This is not an update – correct? A State Scenic and Recreational Highways Plan does not currently exist or is this an update to the Scenic and Recreational Highways Element included in existing state-wide plan? Regarding legal obligation, please refer to V9 above.</p>	<p>Prior Highway System Plans and the State's Multi-Modal Plan have included some discussion of Scenic and Recreational Highways in the past. However, a complete plan that aligns with agency and state policies has not been developed. So, technically it is an update of what has been done in the past. However, it will cover new ground as well.</p>
<p>Comment [V18] What section of the US Code States this? FHWA docket no. 95-15, Section 3a) reads, "Any highway or road submitted for designation under the National Scenic Byways Program by State or Federal agencies should be designated as a State Scenic byway. However, roads that meet all criteria and requirements for National designation but not state or federal agencies designation criteria may be considered for national designation on a case-by-case basis."</p>	<p>The federal law that discusses the National Scenic Byway Grant Program is Title 23, Sec. 162 USC.</p>
<p>Comment [V19] How does distinguishing between state and national programs create support for state strategic planning, when nowhere does it state this in the US Code or FHWA's Interim Policy.</p>	<p>FHWA supports state planning and state definition of goals. Washington state has 5 Transportation Policy Goals and WSDOT is tasked with meeting them. The Scenic and Recreational Highways Program is one of many programs that help Washington state meet the Transportation Policy Goals. The National Scenic Byway Grant Program is one of many federal programs available to help Washington State meet its goals.</p>
<p>Comment [S20] The words "Strategic Plan" are not included in either the code or 1995 interim policy. Both Title 23 & the FHWA's 1995 Interim Policy reference Corridor Management Plans</p>	<p>There appears to be confusion between the US Code that establishes administration of the National Scenic Byways Grant Program and the requirements of state law. All plans in Washington are to be strategic and include goals, objectives and performance measures. Washington in many cases meets and exceeds federal requirements.</p>

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Comment [V21] Why is this included? It doesn't support the purpose for the plan. It seems the only purpose to include this is make the point that the state is not prevented from implementing its own strategies for the National Byways Program... If the state has no agenda to revise the current program, what is the significance of including this section of the USC? It gives the wrong impression of WSDOT objective.</p>	<p>This paragraph is included to show that FHWA supports state planning efforts that help states to make use of the National Scenic Byway Program to help meet their individual goals. The purpose of the Scenic and Recreational Highways Plan is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance to WSDOT programs • Inform other planning efforts such as the Washington Transportation Plan • Provide heightened awareness of the value of the state scenic system • Fulfill the need to include a Scenic and Recreational component to the Multi-Modal Transportation Plan as required by state law (RCW 47.06). <p>This Plan will establish programmatic objectives and performance measures consistent with the State's transportation policy goals (RCW 47.04.280) and will be updated every two years. Some current practices may change to align with the goals, objectives and performance measures – as with implementation of any plan. Not sure what the concern here is related to revision of the current program or if this is in reference to state or federal program. WSDOT can not make changes to the National Scenic Byway Grant Program.</p>
<p>Comment [S22] We should have a list of Steering Committee Members including their names, titles, who they represent, their email address, their phone number and addresses and the contacts for the Scenic Byways as well as Scenic and Recreational Highways. Would also like to request how each steering committee relates to scenic byways versus scenic and recreational highways. Finally, there should be a full listing each of the scenic byway contacts even if this includes more than one person.</p>	<p>WSDOT has invited 18 stakeholder agencies and organizations to participate in the Steering Committee including 2 local non-profit organizations representing local byways. It should be noted that this is broader participation than WSDOT enlists for the development of Washington's Transportation Plan. Each organization and individual participants name is listed in Background Paper #1. Some Steering Committee members ask that their email addresses not be listed on websites to minimize spam. All non-profit organizations representing local byways have been listed on WSDOT's website.</p>
<p>Comment [S23] Most of the Steering Committee members seem to be from Seattle or Olympia. The reason for concern is that the majority of the scenic system is located in rural regions.</p>	<p>Most Steering Committee members represent state agencies and statewide organizations. Public comment is being sought throughout the process.</p>
<p>Comment [S24] The timeline appears to show accepting public comment at the same time as releasing the final plan.</p>	<p>Yes. We will start writing the final plan as soon as the formal public comments start to come in to WSDOT on the draft plan.</p>

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Comment [S25] Where did these three primary purposes and priorities come from? The first meeting stressed the need to remove confusion between Scenic and Recreational Highways and Scenic Byways – this took up a majority of the meeting because the first WSDOT Powerpoint used these two terms interchangeably. Another portion was taken up by an overview on “how to create strategic plans”. Much of it had more to do with scenic byways coordinators questions and concerns.</p>	<p>We discussed the origins of these focus areas or program elements at each of the Steering Committee Meetings. See the presentation given on July 15th available on the WSDOT website. http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/LocalPrograms/ScenicByways/BywaysPlan.htm</p> <p>The state legislative finding in RCW 47.39.020 focuses on planning to prevent incompatible development. Much of the feedback we have received to date indicates that the program has a tourism focus. Also, the majority of the projects seeking funding through the National Scenic Byways Grant Program have to date been related to tourism and traveler services. Stewardship or preserving and protecting natural, cultural, and historic resources is also discussed in the state law and federal guidance. If we have overlooked any area that should be included, please let us know.</p> <p>For the first Steering Committee Meeting on July 15th WSDOT held a listening session to better understand concerns. There was a lot of misinformation floating around and it was important to understand what people understood about the project.</p>
<p>Comment [V26] This statement is not consistent with the current status of WA-scenic byways. Planning: Washington’s program is beyond the planning state in its development. Planning comes at the beginning. Most Scenic Byways have completed CMPs and all National designated byways were required to complete a CMP. Our focus is on implementation, subject to funding, of the already written CMPs and on continued preservation of our byways.</p>	<p>Planning is one focus area of the program that is identified as a priority by the state legislature. While many groups have developed corridor management plans, most of those plans are not as integrated into local, regional and state plans as they could or should be.</p>
<p>Comment [V27] Who are the Byway Interest Groups referred to here? Are these the Byway managers/leaders? If so, they need to be addressed appropriately.</p>	<p>Byway Interest Groups are the local groups with 501C3 non-profit status that advocate for the interests of the byway and are required to form for eligibility and pursuit of the National Scenic Byway Grants. Tribal Nations are not necessarily grouped in here unless they want to be. They may pursue funding through the National Scenic Byway Grant Program by going to FHWA directly.</p>

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Comment [V28] Why isn't the federal program mentioned anywhere in this section? This would be important as Washington State has actively participated in this program since 1992, and byway managers have received funding each year.</p>	<p>The Scenic and Recreational Highways Plan is not addressing the National Scenic Byway Grant Program. The purpose of the Scenic and Recreational Highways Plan is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance to WSDOT programs • Inform other planning efforts such as the Washington Transportation Plan • Provide heightened awareness of the value of the state scenic system • Fulfill the need to include a Scenic and Recreational component to the Multi-Modal Transportation Plan as required by state law (RCW 47.06). <p>This Plan will establish programmatic objectives and performance measures consistent with the State's transportation policy goals (RCW 47.04.280) and will be updated every two years.</p>
<p>Comment [V29] As a participant in that meeting – these priorities did not emerge from this meeting, they were presented as the priorities by WSDOT.</p>	<p>These three themes or elements of the program have emerged through discussion with steering committee members, emails, feedback on the background papers, review of the state and federal laws.</p> <p>The state legislative finding in RCW 47.39.020 focuses on planning to prevent incompatible development. Much of the feedback we have received to date indicates that the program has a tourism focus. Also, the majority of the projects seeking funding through the National Scenic Byways Grant Program have to date been related to tourism and traveler services. Stewardship or preserving and protecting natural, cultural, and historic resources is also discussed in the state law and federal guidance. If we have overlooked any area that should be included, please let us know.</p>
<p>Comment [S30] Not true: tourism is the 4th leading industry in Washington State yet tourism funding is very low compared to Oregon and many other states.</p>	<p>This sentence [While tourism has been a high priority for Washington State in recent years and the state has been a leader in this area] refers to the fact that the majority of applications to the National Scenic Byways Grant Program have been related to tourism or traveler services (ie. Rest areas, travel guides, etc) and Washington won a national award this year for it's CD based/web-based travel guide.</p>
<p>Comment [S31] Please specify this was an amendment to the scenic byway program of the San Juan Islands Byway, which included making all ferries a 'scenic byway' for purposes of the Scenic and Recreational Highways Act.</p>	<p>The State Legislature amended the State Scenic and Recreational Highways Act to include all Washington State Ferries routes. This was not an amendment to the National Scenic Byway Grant Program.</p>

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Comment [V32] This whole section is VERY confusing because in the introduction of this document, the term, Scenic System is state as referring to the Scenic and Recreational Highways network and the term Scenic and Recreational Highway is state as referring to those segments of state highway specifically called out in state law (47.39.020 and RCW 47.42.140) and included in Appendix B of this background paper. According to the header, all highways associated with the Scenic System is meant to be included here?</p>	<p>This section contains two paragraphs describing how a section of state highway is added to the list of Scenic and Recreational Highways. It appears that much of the confusion here about how the state laws and federal laws apply. For the purpose of this plan, we are focused on the requirements in state law and not the National Scenic Byways Grant Program. If you can propose alternative wording that would make this section or other sections clearer to you and accurate, that would be helpful.</p>
<p>Comment [S33] To which section or subsection of which act does this refer?</p>	<p>The State Scenic and Recreational Highways Act (referred to as the Act)</p>
<p>Comment [S34] To my knowledge motor vehicle funds have never been made available for scenic byways. If so, please list or give links to these projects. May Scenic Byways themselves apply for these funds directly?</p>	<p>To date, Washington State has received \$15 million total from the National Scenic Byway Grant Program and WSDOT has dedicated \$9 million in State Gas Tax – Motor Vehicle Funds to Scenic and Recreational Highway Projects. Yes. We have mapped the projects and developed descriptions. This information will be included in the Plan.</p>
<p>Comment [V35] What projects are specifically related to Scenic Byways, recreational highways etc individually? I don't see where the map identifies this. It would be good to know what projects are associated with each. What about investments directly associated with byway improvements and maintenance by byway managers? I think this should be mentioned as this would identify accurate byway project activity.</p>	<p>To date, Washington State has received \$15 million total from the National Scenic Byway Grant Program and WSDOT has dedicated \$9 million in State Gas Tax – Motor Vehicle Funds to Scenic and Recreational Highway Projects. Yes. We have mapped the projects and developed descriptions. This information will be included in the Plan.</p>
<p>Comment [V36] It would help us all if we could see a historical timeline complete with the maps for Scenic Byways and Scenic and Recreational Highways. It would also be invaluable to have a copy of the current legal scenic and recreational highway system including scenic byways.</p>	<p>You will find maps of the Scenic and Recreational Highways on the website posted in mid-July http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/LocalPrograms/ScenicByways/BywaysPlan.htm</p>
<p>Comment [S37] RCW 47.39.040</p>	<p>No concern is stated. Not clear what is intended.</p>
<p>Comment [S38] How does the Growth Management Act fit here? It doesn't follow that because Commerce coordinates (47.39.040) that it will also use their GMA staff, specifically on the scenic byways. Need specific cite section of the GMA.</p>	<p>Washington Administrative Code associated with the GMA recommends that local agencies consider scenic and recreational highways when they are completing their transportation elements of their comprehensive plans. So, GMA Staff will provide technical assistance in this area. For additional detail, you may want to talk with GMA staff at Commerce.</p>

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Comment [V39] Is this talking about existing Scenic Byways? If so, most management plans are already in existence. Additionally, the national program provides clear and complete guidelines on what should be included in the Corridor Management Plans.</p>	<p>This section is discussing the requirements for WSDOT in state law. WSDOT is directed to work with local communities on corridor managements for state highways identified in the law. The state law/administrative code does not currently contain guidance on what corridor management plans in Washington should contain. FHWA provides some general corridor management planning guidance for funding eligibility, but it is not specific to Washington.</p>
<p>Comment [S40] Does this refer to Scenic Byways? If so, replace highway with state scenic byway.</p>	<p>The terms Scenic Byway; National Scenic Byway; and All American Road are not defined in state law in terms of there specific highway sections. The term Scenic and Recreational Highway is defined and segments of state highway are listed in the law. Interim federal guidance for the National Scenic Byway Grant Program discusses the term “Scenic Byway”.</p> <p>So, we are using the term Scenic and Recreational Highway to be clear about what portions of state highway are included. The discussion is not referring to the National Scenic Byways Grant Program.</p>
<p>Comment [S41] Definitions Corridor Management Plan means a written document that specifies the actions, procedures, controls, operational practices and administrative strategies to maintain the scenic, historic, recreational, cultural, archeological and natural qualities of the scenic byway (FHWA’s 1995 Interim Policy referred to Page 2)</p>	<p>The comment provides a definition of Corridor Management Plan from FHWA guidance for funding eligibility. Not sure what is intended.</p>
<p>Comment [V42] FHWA provides clear and specific guidance in what should be included in corridor management plans...</p>	<p>FHWA guidance on Corridor Management Plans is general and related to funding eligibility. It is not specific to Washington. It is unclear what the concern is.</p>
<p>Comment [S43] Scenic System definition</p>	<p>It is unclear what the concern is here.</p>
<p>Comment [S44] Scenic Vistas Act – How specifically does the Scenic Vistas Act relate to Scenic Byways</p>	<p>If we are talking about Scenic and Recreational Highways, they are impacted by the Scenic Vistas Act. If we are talking about routes designated for marketing purposes and rely on the map from 2006, many of those routes mapped are also Scenic and Recreational Highways and would be impacted by the Scenic Vistas Act.</p>
<p>Comment [S45] Excerpt from Highway Advertising Act of 1967</p>	<p>Not clear what the comment or concern is here or what is intended.</p>
<p>Comment [S46] Yet only 2 local agencies sit on the steering committee (Association of Washington Cities and Association of Washington Counties)</p>	<p>These organizations represent all cities and counties in Washington.</p>

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments	WSDOT Responses
Comment [S47] Referenced examples do not necessarily relate to scenic byways. Please give a balanced representation of other states' treatment of their scenic byways.	Before the examples, the background paper says, "This section provides a few examples to stimulate discussion in three primary areas: tourism, stewardship and planning." It isn't intended to be a comprehensive review of other state's programs. Not clear on what the commenter would find to be a balanced representation.
Comment [V48] However, roads that meet all criteria and requirements for National designation but not state or federal agency designation criteria may be considered for national designation on a case by case basis.	Not clear what is intended by this comment.
Comment [S49] While it is true that state law must recognize a byway as a state byway before it can become a national byway, it is only true that the byway be recognized by the governor in order to compete for federal funding.	In Washington, there is a state law addressing this (RCW 47.39). In some states without similar legislation they do executive orders or similar processes to recognize portions of state highway as eligible to pursue federal funding. Not sure what is intended by this comment.
Comment [S50] FHWA Policy Scenic Byway defined.	Not sure what is intended by this comment. Again, there appears to be confusion on the purpose of this plan and the application of federal and state laws. Comment was cut off in .pdf file I received.
Comment [S51] New York's Scenic Vistas Act, which is one component of their Scenic Byway Program. Should include information on Vermont's very successful state and national byway program.	The case studies are intended to provide examples of either planning, stewardship or tourism/traveler services. They were not included as a discussion of all aspects of a state's program. Vermont may have a very successful program, but this case study is specific to its billboard ban.
Comment [S52] Ohio Revised Code quoted in this comment.	Not clear what is intended by this comment.
Comment [S53] In reference to a case study on Transfer Development Rights in Colorado – Regulatory, not for scenic byways management. Scenic byway managers don't deal with land transfers.	WSDOT has observed that local scenic byway groups operate differently across the state. Some do work within the larger planning framework in the state and make use of tools like this. For example, Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust. We need to be inclusive in this Plan and recognize the different goals of each local byway group.
Comment [S54] In reference to a case study on Tree Canopy Ordinance in Florida – How does this relate to scenic byways? Many communities have tree ordinances, the city of Olympia does.	We need to be inclusive in this Plan and recognize the different goals of each local byway group. Protection of tree canopy is a case study example that may appeal to some Washington byway groups and not others.
Comment [S55] California has some of the most restrictive unworkable regulations in this country. Regulatory, does not apply to scenic byway managers.	Not clear what is intended by this comment.

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments	WSDOT Responses
Comment [S56] Please provide a link or source to this coordinated tourism survey and data.	http://www.alabamabyways.org/projects.htm
Comment [S57] Washington Tourism/Department of Commerce works within the tourism industry (including scenic byway managers) to tell our authentic stories. This includes culinary tourism as well as geo/eco tourism, voluntourism, civic tourism and much more. Leslie Johnson NWTT recently participated in a culinary workshop jointly sponsored by WA Agriculture and WA Tourism Departments	Comments appears unrelated to Background Paper#1.
Comment [S58] some discussion of case study and It should be noted that a new Chapter 29 discussing designated scenic highways was recently added to the Department's Project Development and Environmental Manual.	This may be more appropriately inserted into another part of the plan rather than the section dedicated to examples from other states.
Comment [S59] Coastal Management or Coastal Zone Management is completely different from scenic and recreational highway planning and scenic byway planning. This is also not part of the scenic byway program.	We need to be inclusive in this Plan and recognize the different goals of each local byway group. Protection of the coast line is a case study example that may appeal to some Washington byway groups and not others.

Northwest Tribal Tourism Comments	WSDOT Responses
Comment [S60] Excerpt.	Not clear what is intended by this comment.
Comment [S61] Regulatory, This does not appear to apply to scenic byway program.	Not clear what is intended by this comment.
Comment [S62] What has their success been? This was all about the corridor management planning process.	This case study was selected as an example of planning because there as an intergovernmental agreement established as part of the corridor planning process that included seven townships.
Comment [V63] Again, are you talking about the scenic system or scenic and recreational highways as defined in this document's introduction.	Scenic and Recreational Highways
Comment [V64] Does original assessments refer to those conducted in 1962 which were also re-evaluated and again confirmed for national recognition in the 1990s? Why would these need to be re-confirmed and how does this strengthen the foundation of the scenic system?	This refers to all visual quality assessments conducted in the past. New data is available in new forms that may provide additional information and/or confirm that what we learned in the past is still accurate.

Comment [V65] Why would WSDOT put resources into developing preservation strategies when this is the role of byway managers and included in their CMPs. Is a process for evaluation being suggested here to ensure that designated byways still meet the criteria which they were first designated for?	Consistent with all other WSDOT Plans, this Plan will establish goals, implementation steps and performance measures. Currently, there are no performance measures in place for Scenic and Recreational Highways at the state level. This effort may contribute information to performance measurement.
Comment [V66] Which part of state law is being referred to here?	RCW 47.39
Comment [V67] Is this statement directed at scenic byways? If so, the GOALS of each byway appears in the CMP – some may even include how performance is measured. Additionally, who is in need of these tools and or expressed a need for these – byway managers? WSDOT?	Consistent with all other WSDOT Plans, this Plan will establish goals, implementation steps and performance measures. Currently, there are no performance measures in place for Scenic and Recreational Highways at the state level.
Comment [V68] Is this addressing byway managers?	Not clear what is intended by this comment.
Comment [V69] Byway managers	Not clear what is intended by this comment.
Comment [V70] Since all Washington Byways, All-American Roads, Scenic Sites, etc. are part of the overall Scenic and Recreational Highway System, it would add clarity to this Plan if each were listed with its own description and needs/information as a sub-set under the overall system. Therefore, it would be understood how each unique highway is currently defined and what each needs and or lacks.	Good point. Most appear to be part of the Scenic and Recreational Highways. Will consider how to address this in Background Paper #2.
Comment [V71] Byway Managers?	Not clear what is intended by this comment.